DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 237 CS 204 074

AUTHOR O'Brien, Marjorie M.
TITLE The Dilemma of the English Department Head: A Report on the Survey of the Role and Responsibilities of the Heads of English Departments in Massachusetts Secondary Schools.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English, Needham.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 60p.; Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English is an affiliate of the National Council of Teachers of English
AVAILABLE FROM National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801 (Stock No. 11610, $2.00 member, $3.00 non-member)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; *Department Directors (School); Educational Research; *English Departments; *English Instruction; Junior High Schools; Senior High Schools; *State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Junior and senior high school English department heads in Massachusetts were surveyed as part of a project to provide a clearer picture of the extent and diversity of the department head's role and responsibilities, to offer recommendations to make the job more manageable and satisfying, and to provoke discussion and positive action. Separate sections of this report discuss the dilemma of department heads, caught between what they feel should be the priorities of their position and the realities of their situation; findings of the survey; profiles of heads of small, medium-sized, and large departments; regional variances; and recommendations by the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English. Appendixes summarize responses to selected questions, report on implementation of 18 recommendations from the Conference of Secondary School English Department Chairpersons, and provide a selected bibliography for English department heads. (AA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED153237

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE DILEMMA OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT HEAD

A REPORT ON THE SURVEY OF THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE HEADS OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS IN MASSACHUSETTS SECONDARY SCHOOLS

by

Marjorie M. O'Brien

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Spring, 1977

Publications of the
Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English

CS 204 074

THE MASSACHUSETTS COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

Officers 1976-1977

Eileen B. Malloy, President
Ann L. Keenan, Vice-President
Sr. Mary Anderson, Secretary
Ira Steinberg, Treasurer

1975-1976		*1974-1975*
F. Andre Favat	*President*	*Elizabeth A. Ricker*
Eileen B. Malloy	*First Vice-President*	*Elizabeth Murray*
Larry Crouse	*Second Vice-President*	*F. Andre Favat*
Sr. Mary Anderson	*Secretary*	*William Travers*
James Leonard	*Treasurer*	*Gordon Wood*

The Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English, an affiliate of the National Council of Teachers of English, is an organization devoted to promoting excellence in the teaching of the English language arts. Its membership is open to all who share this aim.

The Council issues a quarterly newsletter, News and Notes, and under the general name of "Publications of the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English," publishes other materials which address themselves to substantive matters affecting the teaching of the English language arts.

Members receive Council publications as part of their membership or at nominal cost. Single copies of this volume can be obtained from the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English, 205 Hampshire Street, Lawrence, Massachusetts 01841.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote brief passages in a review, or by members of the NCTE Information Exchange agreement.

In Memoriam
F. Andre Favat, 1938-1976

Copyright (c) 1977 by the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English

PREFACE

The following report is based on a survey of the role and responsibilities of the English department heads in Massachusetts public secondary schools conducted in May, 1975 under the sponsorship of the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English.

The purpose of this report is at least three-fold: to provide a clearer picture of the extent and diversity of the role and its responsibilities, to offer recommendations to make the job more manageable and satisfying, and to provoke discussion and positive action. The focus of the report might well have been placed on the considerable accomplishments of the English department heads in Massachusetts and their professional competency and dedication. To continue to improve English instruction in this state, it was decided, however, that existing problems should be brought to light in order that they be given attention by appropriate professional groups.

National attention was called to the role of the English department head as early as 1964. The National Study of High School English Programs, recognizing the importance of department heads, then held two invitational conferences which resulted in the formulation of twenty-three recommendations concerning the organization, administration, and supervision of English departments. At its Annual Convention in 1969, the National Council of Teachers of English approved the establishment of the Conference of Secondary School English Department Chairmen (CSSEDC), which revised the earlier recommendations into eighteen and reissued them in 1972. Thus, it was decided that the *Eighteen Recommendations for Secondary English Departments* should become an important part of the state survey and serve as a means of self-assessment for the heads of English departments in Massachusetts.

The state survey was limited to senior and junior high schools in the public sector only, since general observation of the size and nature of schools in the private sector seemed to indicate that the role and responsibilities of their English department heads should be studied separately and at some other point.

Though the survey was originally designed for high school department heads, it was later extended to junior high school department heads. In order to ascertain which junior high school English departments had a department head, an initial mailing was sent to the principals of the 195 junior high schools in the state. Responses from 130 of these principals located sixty persons functioning as heads of English departments at that level. The response from these department heads was relatively small, 28% of the known population, and so the data and the results were treated and reported separately. Despite the small sample, however, the junior high figures are parallel to and largely substantiate the high school findings.

In reading any of the statements found in this report, it is important to realize that the roles and responsibilities of department heads vary considerably, and show a wide range of grades and number of teachers supervised, of teaching responsibilities, of salary, of support services, and of other factors. Thus, though these data reveal much that department heads share in common, all results must be examined with the "apples-and-oranges" analogy in mind. It is also important to note that all data, including salary figures, apply to the spring of 1975.

With the questionnaire providing 191 variables, the amount of the complete data obtained was very great, and far too much for inclusion in this report. The complete data and survey analysis is available through the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English, as is further information which might be desired about any section or subgroup of the report.

As I conducted the survey, analyzed the data, and wrote the report, a number of people have given me their cooperation. First, I wish to thank the 182 English department heads who took the time and care to respond to the questionnaire, and to assure them that their replies were treated with complete confidentiality. Each return was renumbered, and the computerizing of the information was so handled that the data could not be interpreted by others.

I also wish to thank the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English for its support, and, in particular, I wish to thank its recent presidents: Dr. Elizabeth A. Ricker, who early on saw the plight of the department head

and initiated the idea of this survey; the late Dr. F. Andre Favat, who believed in its importance and planned for the publication of the report; and Mrs. Eileen B. Malloy, who brought the project to fruition.

Marjorie M. O'Brien
Director

Head of the English Department
Somerville High School
Somerville, Massachusetts 02143

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE		iii
I.	THE DEPARTMENT HEAD DILEMMA	1
II.	THE SURVEY	7
	A. Background Information	7
	B. Responses to the "General Information" Section	8
	C. Responses to the "Specific Supervisory/ Administrative Responsibilities" Section	10
	D. Responses to the "You and Your Position" Section	11
	E. Responses to the "Eighteen CSSEDC Recommendations" Section	14
	F. Responses to the "Open-Ended Questions" Section	15
III.	THREE PROFILES	22
	A. Head of a Small Department	22
	B. Head of a Medium-Sized Department	24
	C. Head of a Large Department	25
IV.	REGIONAL VARIANCES	29
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS BY MCTE	35
APPENDICES		
A.	SELECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES	43
B.	DEGREES OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CSSEDC'S EIGHTEEN RECOMMENDATIONS	47
C.	A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR ENGLISH DEPARTMENT HEADS	51

I

THE DILEMMA OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD

All too often in the secondary schools of Massachusetts, the position of English department head is vaguely defined, constantly changing, and usually increasing in responsibilities to the point that persons holding these positions often find their time more consumed by the coping than the coordination, and by clerical duties than by supervision and curriculum. As a result, they, as professional educators, experience considerable tension between what they feel should be the priorities of their position and what they find to be the realities of their situation.

One of the reasons that this dilemma has developed is that the head of the department "fills an administrative vacuum created by the rapid growth of public education in America during this century,"[1] not only in size but also in complexity. Superintendents and principals and their staffs are no longer able to keep abreast of what actually takes place in the classroom and of developments in many varied and complex curricular fields. As secondary education has increased in complexity, so has the role of the department head, who in many cases has had to assume more and more responsibility for the supervision, appointment, and evaluation of teachers and for curriculum development. Generally, the department head serves as a liaison with all facets of central administration (including curriculum, personnel, budget, and public relations), as well as with pupils, teachers within the department and throughout the school, guidance personnel, parents, and community organizations.

In the field of English, while the attention of its leadership has been caught by the enigmatic question "What is English?", only scattered attention has been given to defining clearly the roles and responsibilities of the crit cally influential position occupied by the department head. In their report on the National Study of High School English Programs conducted in the 1960s, Squire and Apple-

---

[1]Michael G. Callahan, *The Effective School Department Head* (West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1971), p. 21.

bee stated that "Effective leadership is essential. The quality of both the school principal and the department chairman directly affects the English program, for it is they who are or should be ultimately responsible for teaching conditions, climate of work, coordination and sequence in the curriculum, and the selection and continuing education of the rest of the faculty."[1] A strong department head, according to these writers, is particularly important in city systems for a successful English program.

Gladys Veidemanis, who has spoken aptly and often about the department head position, described the problem this way:

> Judging by the NCTE report, the word "role" should surely be plural, underlined, and starred. We don't expect much of a department chairman, do we? He needs only to be a master teacher; a curriculum expert, innovator, and coordinator; a specialist in human relations; a knowledgeable supervisor and consultant; and, in a real sense, a business administrator and office manager. We must also not fail to mention his steady casting in positions of leadership in local, state, and national professional activities and the implicit assumption that he occasionally evidence his competence by professional appearances or publications. And, of course, as a one-man repertory company, our department chairman must be able to shift agilely from role to role, accepting controversy, change, and frustration as normal components of the situation he has been assigned to handle.[2]

While departmental leaders have usually found their roles increasing in complexity and number, the position over the past forty years throughout the United States has been subject to fluctuation and change: some systems have adopted it during this period; others have modified or even abandoned existing department head slots; some have reinstated the position after less satisfaction with other

[1]James R. Squire and Roger K. Applebee, *High School English Instruction Today* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968), pp. 245-46.

[2]Gladys Veidemanis, "Frankly Speaking: A Candid View of the Department Chairman's Role," *English Journal*, LVI (September 1967), pp. 828-29.

organizational patterns. In many systems, the role still needs clearer definition and description, rather than elimination. This department head position continues to prevail in the administrative structure of the majority of secondary schools throughout the country.

Unfortunately, though, administrative decisions have resulted too often in the waste of the potential value of the department leader. The essential purpose of the position is the improvement of instruction, which the department head can promote by wise selection and assignment of personnel, curriculum improvement, course articulation, inservice education, and general supervision by serving as master teacher, resource person, and catalyst. If the system administration recognizes these as priority roles, it must address itself to several issues:

1. Is the department head to be overloaded with minutiae of detail, left drowning in paperwork, to serve as a glorified clerk, paperpusher, or butler to the department, or granted the necessary authority, support, time, and assistance to be able to provide real departmental leadership?
2. Is the department head to be a teacher's teacher or a front-line administrator?
3. Is this person to function principally as an expediter or as a decision-maker and supervisor?
4. If the latter emphasis is selected, is a line or staff position more effective for the department head role in that school?

If instruction and learning are the heart of the school, the English department, which is generally the largest but not always the best supplied with space and equipment, is likely to be one of the school's busiest areas. Department heads find themselves at the epicenter of the increased tension, intensified pace, and the greater complexity and bureaucratization of the modern secondary school. Since the advent of professional negotiations has brought administration and teachers into an adversary relationship, the department head is too often caught in the middle. These department leaders find themselves required to communicate, interpret, defend, and implement administrative policies and procedures, often without having had

an opportunity to give input or at least to be heard on an issue. Faculty, meanwhile, insist that their professional competence and academic freedom be fully recognized. Students reflect the tension, unrest, and uncertainty of the 1970s, and too many schools are experiencing increased disciplinary problems, which add to the strain of all faculty, and thereby indirectly as well as directly to the responsibilities of the department head. To try to cope with increased problems, systems create new school and community agencies and alternative learning structures, and sooner or later, these involve the English department and its head.

One of the purposes, therefore, of this study has been to explore how well prepared and supported are the department heads in Massachusetts to handle the increased responsibilities and tensions of their roles. A fundamental observation has been that the position of English department head in Massachusetts varies considerably in title, role, and responsibilities. The person functioning as an inhouse department head may be called the chairperson, head of department, coordinator, supervisor, or even director. The grades supervised may be limited to those in the high school or junior high school or be extended so far as to include Kindergarten through Grade 12. The department head may supervise only one other teacher or over seventy colleagues. There exists a wide range in teaching and other responsibilities, salary, and support services. There usually is one person responsible for the direction of the English program in a secondary school, but sometimes several supervisory personnel share responsibility. The size, location, student needs, organizational structure, and financial condition of a school district affect its administrative organization and staff functions.

For many systems, therefore, one of the key issues facing their administrators is the degree to which the position should be extended while leaving the job manageable and performable. Addition of duties seems to be the rule; subtraction is rare. The more that extraneous jobs are piled on the department head, the more likely that the leadership function becomes extraneous. If the administration decides to increase the extent or degree of leadership responsibility or the supervisory load of the department head, it is necessary that it also provide the needed support resources and services, an equitable salary, and, above all, the time to do the job well.

If expectations and demands are to be kept within reasonable bounds, certain steps must be taken. The administration must make a careful review of the job's specifications, its components and parameters, and consult present department heads and other faculty. A detailed job description should be prepared and regularly updated. When the department head position is filled, selection must be made on the basis of professional preparation, experience, and qualifications. Administration should review its policies and procedures to determine that sufficient resources and authority are provided the department head and to assign elsewhere fringe activities and responsibilities more appropriate to other personnel. Newly appointed department leaders need carefully planned and thorough orientation to their positions. Those who have not held a similar position or had experience as subchairpersons in at least some of the tasks require particular training. School systems and nearby universities should cooperate in providing professional courses and continuing programs geared to the specific needs of department leaders. It is very important that department heads be informed and consulted and not be "the last to know" of alternatives under consideration or decisions being made which affect their departments. Schedules and deadlines need to be coordinated; as department heads work with most branches of the school and administration, they often face conflicting dates and demands.

It is vital, therefore, that the job be understood, realistically structured, clearly defined, and given recognition, authority and support. Too often, the department head reaches the end of the day or week or quarter drained of psychic and physical energy by the conflict between expectations and reality. The administration and the community have certain expectations for the position and the department. Perceiving what the job should be and could accomplish, the department leader has established certain goals and department priorities. If there is no real accord between precept and reality, then frustration and fatigue set in, decreasing the likelihood of the department head's effectiveness and professional satisfaction.

This survey by the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English is intended to focus on the key functional components of the department head position and to define its dimensions and limits as established in secondary

schools in Massachusetts. From the results of the study, recommendations have been drawn which, if implemented, should enable the head of the English department to perform well the many duties of the position.

II

THE SURVEY

A. Background Information

The high school questionnaire was mailed in May, 1975 to the heads of the English departments in the 324 Massachusetts public high schools then on the mailing list of the Massachusetts Department of Education and returned by 164 of them, with an additional response in the form of a letter. As the mailing list actually included some schools no longer operating at the high school level, one school no longer in existence, and several which shared the department head with another school, the total number of department heads in Massachusetts appropriate for this survey was about 315. The high school response was approximately 52%. The delayed mailing to the sixty identifiable junior high school department heads brought 17 replies, a return of 28%.

Based on the Massachusetts Department of Education Regional Map, the geographical composition of the high school responses was: Greater Boston 25.6%; Northeast 20.1%; Southeast 23.2%; Greater Worcester 18.3%; Springfield area 7.9%; Pittsfield area 4.3%. One response had the code number deleted.

While local academic high schools represented 75.6% of the high school returns, 11% of the responses came from regional academic high schools, 4.9% from regional vocational high schools, 4.3% from local junior-senior high schools, and 1.8% from regional junior-senior high schools. In addition, one response each (.6%) was received from a local vocational school, a county agricultural school, an alternative school, and a school with the code deleted.

Although the questionnaire was addressed to the English department chairperson, it directed that, if the position of chairperson did not exist, the respondent was to be the person who held the nearest equivalent position with supervisory and administrative responsibilities for the department of English.

The questionnaire consisted of five sections: (1) general information about the school, supervisory

range, size of department, and teaching and other non-administrative duties; (2) specific supervisory/administrative responsibilities, including managerial activities, responsibilities for teacher selection, supervision of instruction and teacher evaluation, curriculum responsibilities, and professional leadership activities; (3) questions about the department head position and incumbent, including preparation, certification, experience, professional memberships, requirements for the position, job description, salary, evaluation, and types of support and administrative assistance; (4) the degree of implementation of the *Eighteen Recommendations* of the Conference of Secondary School English Department Chairmen made in 1972; (5) six optional open-ended questions on changes observed or anticipated in the position, duties held appropriate to the position and respondent recommendations, and suggestions of ways that the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English could serve department heads.

When returns were received, they were edited and coded for the computer, and the 191 variables were keypunched. After a program was prepared for the computer, frequency distributions and other appropriate statistics were then obtained for the general population and for subgroups according to the type of school, geographical location, size of department, and some other variables. Cross tabulations were made of selected variables, and chi squares were obtained with the level of significance.

Based on the analysis of the data and of the responses to the open-ended questions, a series of recommendations was approved by the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English Executive Board and is contained at the close of this report.

B. Responses to the "General Information" Section

1. School Population: The largest number of responses of both the senior and junior high school department heads came from schools in the range of 500-999 pupils; next in frequency were those from schools in the 1000-1499 group. Because of the number of large high schools (17.2% over 2000), the high school mean (1328 pupils) was considerably higher than that of the junior high schools.

2. Administrative Title: Although a number of different titles were reported, over half in the high

school and junior high school groups are called department head; one-fourth indicated that their title is department chairperson (or chairman); the next most frequent titles were department curriculum coordinator and director. A small sampling of other titles was also reported.

3. Grade Span Supervised: Approximately 60% of the high school department heads supervise teachers in the high school grades only, while 23.8% supervise 7-12, and 9.1% have K-12 responsibility. Of the junior high school respondents, only one had supervisory duties beyond Grades 7-9. While 70% of the junior high school department heads share responsibility with another supervisor, only 37% of the high school department heads do.

4. Full-time English Teachers: The high school respondents supervise anywhere from one to seventy full time English teachers. The mean for this group is 16.5 (although the median would be somewhat lower because only about one-third of the high school department heads have supervisory loads exceeding the mean). The mean for the junior high school department heads is 12.0 full-time teachers within a narrower range.

5. Part-time English Teachers: The majority reported no teachers with fewer than three English classes daily; the others usually had no more than five teachers in this category.

6. Other Supervisory Data: The majority of department heads had no more than five non-tenured teachers (an important factor because of the greater amount of supervision usually needed for this group). Although over 70% of the department heads supervise teachers in only one school, three high school department heads and one at the junior high school level supervise twelve or more schools. About one-fourth of the high school department heads (none at the junior high level) reported that they supervise aides; the number of aides ranges from 1-9, but most reported one aide, if any.

7. Teaching and Other Assignments: Eight percent of the high school respondents (and one person at the junior high school level) reported having no regularly assigned classes. Those high school department heads teaching regularly averaged three classes (and two preparations) daily, while their junior high school colleagues averaged four classes (with three preparations) daily. The number of department heads who had study hall or homeroom assignments was not high, although cafeteria and

corridor duty were more often listed, especially by the junior high school department heads.

C. Responses to the "Specific Supervisory/ Administrative Responsibilities" Section

1. Managerial Activities: Both high school department heads and those at the junior high school level reported a wide range of managerial activities. (The frequencies for these and other activities described in Section C can be found in Appendix A.) High school department heads indicated more frequent involvement in arranging teacher and pupil schedules than did their junior high school counterparts; otherwise, the duties were similar.

2. Teacher Selection: Although a small percentage reported no responsibility in this area, four out of five respondents in each group indicated that they interview applicants and recommend appointment to the appropriate administrator. A somewhat higher percentage of junior high school department heads reported involvement in locating prospective teachers, while just over half of each group observe applicants in a teaching situation.

3. Supervision: Most of the listed supervisory activities were checked off by most respondents but not to the extent that the managerial tasks had been. At least two-thirds of the high school department heads and their junior high school colleagues conduct orientation of new, student, and substitute teachers and assist teachers in meeting individual needs and in evaluation. A somewhat higher percentage of department heads at the high school level help develop inservice programs than do those at the junior high schools. About half in each group plan and prepare testing programs for the department. Less than one-third teach demonstration classes or use videotaped demonstration lessons.

4. Observations: The number of classes observed per tenured teacher ranges from none to well over ten. ("Ten" became an arbitrary maximum, set with the realization that very frequent observation, even in small schools, was not likely to mean a formal visit/report/conference, which those respondents giving smaller numbers probably intended.) Most department heads reported two or three visits per tenured teacher and three or four visits per non-tenured teacher. Based on the answers to several questions, the range of observations that department heads make

a year ran from none to over three hundred. The mean of visits is 60.96, but the majority of department heads make fewer classroom visits yearly. Although a small number of respondents indicated no responsibility for formal teacher evaluation or none conducted, roughly two-thirds share the responsibility with the principal or vice-principal; others share it with other administrators; a few have sole responsibility.

5. Curriculum: Although almost 100% of the respondents indicated that they had prepared or revised some phase of the curriculum within the past three years, a narrower range of the listed curriculum responsibilities was reported, especially by the junior high school department heads, in comparison to the diversity of managerial and supervisory activities. High school department heads reported more involvement in curriculum evaluation, elective programs, program guides, independent study programs, and humanities/related arts programs, whereas junior high school department heads were heavily engaged in developing a professional library and a department file.

6. Professional Leadership: At least two-thirds of each group reported that they inform their departments regarding research and innovation, supervise textbook adoption, and attend professional conferences. High school department heads are more likely than those at the junior high school level to attend school committee meetings, participate in school-wide planning, help evaluate other schools or colleges, teach college methods classes, and take a leadership role in an English professional organization.

C. Responses to the "You and Your Position" Section

While the age, volunteered by 89% of the respondents, ranged from twenty-five to over sixty, the high school mean was forty-four years, and the junior high school mean was thirty-eight years. The respondents in each group were almost 2:1 male. Regarding the number of years in the department head position, about half of the high school department heads have held the position for six years or less; almost half of their junior high school colleagues have been in the leadership position for two years or less. About one-fourth of the high school group indicated that they hold a supervisory certificate in Massachusetts (also a very few are so certified in another state)

with a somewhat higher response from the junior high school group. (There may have been some confusion of this with a teaching certificate; some answers indicated uncertainty.) The average respondent in both groups has some graduate credits beyond the master's degree, somewhat higher for the high school group. About 6% are in the doctoral category. At least six respondents indicated that they hold two master's degrees. Over two-thirds of the respondents have taken a graduate level course within the previous three years. Fifty percent of the high school and 23.5% of the junior high school respondents answered that they had received no professional preparation specifically designed for departmental leadership. Possibly because the average age is younger and appointment more recent, junior high school respondents were more likely to have taken at least one university course or inservice training in this area than were their high school colleagues.

Professional memberships in national, Massachusetts, and New England organizations of English teachers were, respectively, for the high school respondents: 78%, 67.7%, and 49.4%; for the junior high school respondents: 64.7%, 52.9%, and 47.1%. Membership in CSSEDC was listed by 19.5% of the high school group and by 5.9% of the junior high school group. While 8.5% of the high school department heads indicated that they had had an article or book published within the past five years, 23.5% (four persons) of the junior high school respondents gave an affirmative answer.

At least half of the respondents indicated that a master's degree is required for their position, although a significant number (SHS: 32.9% / JHS: 11.8%) checked off that no preparation beyond that for a teaching position is required. About half reported a requirement of a certain number of years of teaching experience. Over 50% of each group considered that their job description needed improvement or was "inaccurate, unrealistic, or outdated." (Fourteen percent of the high school and 5.9% of the junior high school group reported having no job description.) Only about one-fourth had had any input into their job description.

While one-fourth of the respondents indicated that their school year is the same as that of the classroom teacher, 50% said that, although it is officially the same, in reality, it is longer. Less than one-fifth checked that

their school year is officially longer.

More than half the respondents described their salary provision as an extra stipend rather than one based on a ratio system. The salary provision appears so varied in nature, with so many factors involved, that a clear-cut picture is difficult. While 26.2% of the high school respondents and 17.6% of the junior high school group took the option not to list salary amount, the salaries volunteered ranged for 1974-1975 from a base of $10,000 upwards, with only one respondent listing a salary over $24,000 for that period. The mean amount for high school department heads was $16,526, while the mean for their junior high school counterparts was $16,107.

About half of the respondents indicated that they have been appointed with tenure rights (although at least one person commented that "this has never been tested"). Only one respondent checked that he had been elected by department members. Others were appointed for a set term of 1-3 years or reported a year-to-year appointment or one in effect "until withdrawn." Forty-four and one-half percent of the high school and 52.9% of the junior high school department heads were appointed from within the department. While less than one-fifth are not formally evaluated as department heads, the most frequently named evaluator of the others is the principal. When evaluated, less than half the respondents are evaluated by criteria related to their department head position.

Of the types of support listed in the questionnaire, somewhat more of the various support factors and services were checked by the high school group than by the junior high school respondents. Morale factors, though, were slightly higher for the junior high group. Both groups felt less support from personnel farther removed from the school: 92.7% of the high school and 100% of the junior high school respondents reported support from teachers, with lesser amounts each time for school administration, central administration, and school committee, down to 24.4%/17.6% for parental and community support. Types of administrative assistance were somewhat better for the high school department heads (e.g., more likely to have a private office and telephone) than for their junior high school colleagues, but these provisions were inadequate for both groups. Of the high school respondents, over one-third reported having no assistance, and only 25% had more

than ten hours a week of any combination of assistance, paid or unpaid. Over two-thirds of the junior high school respondents had no assistance; the rest reported only a very few hours of aid.

The section of the questionnaire in which the respondent was asked to estimate the approximate number of hours per average week spent on various activities came toward the end when fatigue had probably set in, leading to hasty and rough estimates. The "total hours spent on teaching" was intended to include preparation and correction time, and the majority of respondents added it into this total. For those who did not, the figure was increased proportionate to the number of daily classes. Although supervision and curriculum were stressed by respondents in earlier sections, the amount of time indicated for these activities weekly was relatively small. The estimated total time spent on the job ranged from about forty hours per week (with an allowance for preparation and correction time, where omitted) to over seventy.

E. Responses to the "Eighteen CSSEDC Recommendations" Section

An examination of the Massachusetts responses to the *Eighteen Recommendations* indicates that those recommendations that pertain to the professional attitudes and the performance of duties by department heads, and in certain cases by teachers, have a higher degree of implementation, generally, than do those recommendations that require the provision of time or money by Administration. Attention is called, in particular, to the need for implementation in most schools of Recommendation 2: for the organization in large departments of a steering committee with common preparation periods and released time for meeting; Recommendation 8: for adequate time to inform the community concerning the teaching of English; Recommendation 10: for released time or compensatory pay for teachers involved in curriculum development; Recommendation 11: for clerical help for the department, with one full-time clerk for each fifteen teachers; and Recommendation 14: for room libraries and a resource center.

While certain recommendations are implemented somewhat less fully at the junior high school level, it is noted that Recommendation 9: for released time and a stipend for department heads proportionate to department size

appears to be more satisfactorily implemented at the junior high school level. The percentage of both senior and junior high school departments where a policy for handling community complaints about the English curriculum is not in effect is rather high and noteworthy.

The list of the Eighteen CSSEDC Recommendations and the degree to which the English department heads in Massachusetts assessed that each recommendation had been implemented in their departments is presented in Appendix B.

F. Responses to the "Open-Ended Questions" Section

1. High School Respondents

Most of the respondents (102 of 164--62%) took the additional time to analyze and react to their position freely, this section often appearing to serve as a kind of catharsis. Their answers, individually and collectively, often seemed to reflect a lack of clear role definition. The tension inherent in the multiple responsibilities of the department head position was revealed in their assessment of what their position has been in recent years, where it presently is and where it seems to be heading, and what the duties and responsibilities should be.

Changed? Strengthened? Weakened? Most of the respondents to this question indicated that their position is in a state of flux. Perhaps because of the diversity of the department head position, partly because of many educational developments, and often because of local conditions, this change varies considerably and is viewed differently according to the individual's point of view and relationship with administration and other colleagues. Of the differing views of the nature of the change taking place, about twice as many considered that the position had been strengthened as those who saw it as weakened. A lesser group saw no significant change. The majority of the 102 emphasized that the position has mushroomed, with responsibilities even "trebled." Although most viewed this increase in responsibility as a strengthening of the position, a significant number indicated that this growth has weakened and fragmented the position.

Those who saw the extended responsibilities as a strengthening action mentioned their greater participation in supervision, evaluation, curriculum development,

scheduling, management by objectives, hiring and promotion, inservice and workshops, and general government of the school. Several expressed the point that the department head is no longer a figurehead but now has a stronger voice in decision-making. A good number mentioned increases in personnel, responsibilities for discipline, more meetings, reports and clerical duties. A few specified that they were coordinating more grades or had become head of a humanities program or a K-12 director. While one director saw this last change as a move toward real leadership, another claimed this change had weakened the position since a director was less accessible to teachers and students. (Perhaps greater support and clerical services received by the former made the change seem more desirable.)

Those who saw increased responsibilities as weakening emphasized that their responsibilities had become unrealistic and unfeasible, with no increase in pay or assistance. A few described a reduction in grade responsibility or coordination, a requirement to represent increasingly the principal and his policies, a consolidation of three departments into one in a smaller school, or a loss of the authority to evaluate. A few indicated that their position had been abolished or would soon be. One respondent mentioned being department head in name only; another looked forward to being paid for the first time for duties long performed; while a third was still doing the work without pay or status. A few indicated that they were new to the position and, therefore, unable to judge how the position had changed in recent years.

Most time-consuming aspects of the position? The most frequently mentioned in this category was, by far, "clerical madness." The next in frequencies were supervision and evaluation, budget preparation and defense, care and distribution of books, teaching and correcting, and curriculum and program responsibilities. With several mentions each were: meetings, reports and forms, work with new teachers, details, problem-solving, day-to-day chores, reviewing and purchasing materials, discipline, public relations, and general administrative chores for the school or "being bugged by administrators."

Most rewarding aspects? Respondents most frequently cited the rewards of teaching and the respect, appreciation, and successes of their students. Next in frequency was the work with "cooperative, sympathetic,

intelligent, caring teachers": helping, counseling, and supervising them, and encouraging individual growth. Other rewards often included were: improving curriculum, developing new programs (electives, activity-learning, reading, etc.), participating in the total operation of the school, and professional leadership.

Most frustrating aspects? Respondents referred to a great range of frustrating aspects of the job. Multiple mentions were made of: clerical duties, handling day-to-day problems and complaints, the barrage of requests, constant interruptions, budgetary limitations and restrictions, "administrivia," bureaucracy and red tape, teaching pressures, public relations, politics and the school committee, need to justify college board scores, "back-to-basics" pressures, failure to see improvement in basic skills and literacy, lack of coordination, lack of space and physical conditions, unsatisfactory coordination, and a deficit in communication, in truth, and in support. Occasionally mentioned were: scheduling, curriculum difficulties, low morale, lack of a clear job description, and only token involvement in hiring. Some items were of a local nature (e.g., assigned to eighteen study halls/week). To sum up by combining several opinions, the position requires too much responsibility with too little power, and too much clerical work with too little assistance.

Possible changes in the next few years? The largest proportion of respondents who tried to conjecture how the position would change considered that there would be a continuing increase in general responsibility and work, accountability, improved articulation, and more time required for curriculum, supervision, and the other specific duties. These increases would include more clerical duties, paperwork, a "paper prison." Some foresaw more discipline problems and restless students. The next largest number believed that there would be no significant change in the position, or very little "in the light of reality." A small number spoke of possible reductions from cochairperson to chairperson, from seven subject-area department heads to three, from department head to Master Teacher, or the elimination of a directorship if the economy continued to decline. A few others saw a move toward less responsibility, more menial and clerical duties, or a deterioration by adding more of the duties of an assistant principal.

Although some looked forward to having their

roles officially extended, little hope was expressed for improved working conditions. At least one respondent had considered resigning, "never having felt so frustrated professionally." A more positive view was expressed that, by uniting forces, department heads could become a force for change if they want to be.

Duties proper to the position and recommendations? Although individual respondents emphasized different aspects of the department head role, stress was placed on: supervision and evaluation, curriculum development, "resource" service regarding materials and teaching approaches, clear budgetary allotment and discretion, hiring involvement and authority, coordination and articulation, public relations and realistic teaching assignments (in relation to department size). Need was expressed for more forceful and wise administrative leadership in the school and central offices; a proper work area for teachers and a private area for the department head; better equipment; a clear, valid, fair, and realistic job description drawn up with department head involvement; freedom to innovate and experiment; better teacher morale and administrative support and trust.

The four-letter word most frequently expressed was TIME: time needed for planning and programs, time to reduce the feelings of guilt and frustration, time to do the job well. To accomplish this, the department head needs secretarial help, at least part-time depending on department size, and the elimination of menial, disciplinary, routine, clerical, and errand-boy duties. Several expressed the value of the eighteen CSSEDC Recommendations, which one stated "would suffice if fully implemented."

Assistance from the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English? By the number and variety of suggestions offered, it is clear that the respondents saw the Council as having an important role to play in providing them with assistance in their roles.

The respondents wanted to be informed about innovations, materials, programs, ideas, and directions in the teaching of English. They felt that the Council should conduct conferences for department heads to share information and suggestions, ideas, and resources. They wanted close contact with colleagues from similar schools, perhaps through a list of schools wanting to exchange depart-

ment head and teacher visits, and urged the establishing of a state affiliate of CSSEDC.

The respondents urged a number of regular informal meetings, the publishing of a magazine to which teachers could be encouraged to contribute, film viewings of professional materials, lists of guest lecturers, poets, artists, and the exchanging of curriculum guides.

The respondents requested that the Council continue to collect data about program development, staffing patterns, role responsibilities and the like, and to disseminate the results to school committees and administrators, to the Massachusetts Association of Secondary School Principals, the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, the Massachusetts Teachers Association, and the American Federation of Teachers, with recommendations for change.

They also urged that the Council sponsor legislation to establish more uniform working conditions throughout the state, and in general to use political strategies to establish the rights of the department head. They urged enforcing of the Eighteen Recommendations of CSSEDC.

Additional comments? The general reaction to the survey was very positive, for "zeroing in on areas of concern of department heads everywhere." Many respondents expressed appreciation for the survey and interest in its results. Some respondents made such concluding remarks as: "Very few are trying to become department head--this indicates what a job it is"; "I'm a middle-man at everyone's bidding"; "The job used to be rewarding." One department head, still new to the job, was "suffering from information input overload" and should receive the sympathy of those who recall their initiation to the role. One other remark seemed to speak for so many: "Please, your prayers!"

2. Junior High School Respondents

Twelve of the seventeen junior high school respondents returned this additional section. With a smaller number of responses, it is somewhat more difficult to observe patterns.

The responses were about evenly divided as to whether their position had been strengthened or weakened.

Some respondents mentioned increases in supervision, workshops, 766 problems, computer scheduling, coordination, and involvement in hiring. As weakening factors, budget cuts and the requirement to supervise substitute teachers were listed.

Most time-consuming were tasks related to the inventory of books, supplies, and equipment, plus other clerical duties. Also mentioned were coordination of three schools, curriculum, and supervision. As the most frustrating aspects of the position, these respondents listed: budgets, reports, clerical work, unnecessary meetings, "administrative flak," discipline, and lack of voice in teacher selection. Similarly to the high school group, these respondents referred to the satisfaction of teaching, working with cooperative teachers, and developing successful programs.

No definite pattern was found in the respondents' answers as to possible changes in their role in the next few years. Those who saw the role as growing foresaw the effects of reorganization of a large system into districts, tighter guidelines, clear-cut behavioral objectives, and resultant accountability.

Responses to the question of what duties are proper to the position were scattered. Some respondents would like to serve as a sounding board for school policy and as resource people. One department head probably spoke for many by expressing the desire "to make teaching exciting, useful, inspiring; to help teachers survive until June with their sense of proportion intact; and to maintain communication." Another respondent advocated that more credence should be given to the voice of experience; "Talk to us personally." Released time for curriculum development was also stressed.

The responses to the question of how the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English could help them ran parallel to those from the high school. In addition to the high school suggestions, these department heads advocated meetings of their group and conferences devoted to their particular needs, with the emphasis on "what's really happening"; recognition of the junior high school/middle school as a force all its own, not as a mini-high school; more time to visit other school systems without the department having to cover; and the idea of focusing (only upon

invitation) on what is really happening, good or bad, in a particular system in order to provide comparative information and data to help teachers gain a realistic perspective and to help justify programs.

Among comments offered were these: "Don't rely on the same systems all the time"; "It is important that department heads teach at each level to understand the problems and that other administrators teach some classes also"; "Schools suffer as leadership moves away from the classroom."

In conclusion, the junior high school responses to the six questions ran parallel to those from the senior high school respondents; they also indicated some reactions and needs particular to the supervisory role of the department head at this level.

III

THREE PROFILES

The role and responsibilities of the English department head generally vary according to the size of the department. As the size of the high school or the number of schools supervised does not necessarily indicate the extent of the responsibilities, it was decided to determine departmental size by the number of full-time English teachers being supervised. Data were obtained for the role in small, medium-sized, and large departments.

A. Head of a Small Department

How does the position of department head in a relatively small department with one to ten full-time English teachers contrast with the description based on all high school responses? (As the majority of junior high school department heads reported departments of ten or fewer full-time teachers, this profile will, in most respects, apply also to their position.)

The fifty-three respondents in this group indicate that the heads of smaller departments are somewhat less likely than the average department head to have responsibilities beyond the high school grades and more likely to function in one school only, a high school with fewer than one thousand pupils. Over half of these department leaders teach four classes; only 13% have fewer than three classes to teach. These department heads are somewhat more likely to have study hall, homeroom, or patrol-type assignments. Their managerial duties are similar to those of the general population, with slight variations. They are involved somewhat less in the teacher-selection process and in certain supervisory duties, such as supervising the student teacher arrangements and developing inservice programs. With a heavy teaching assignment and a smaller school population, they are less likely to be involved in curriculum activities, such as writing or revising a departmental philosophy, developing a resource center or an Advanced Placement Program, engaging outside specialists or community participation in curricular decisions, developing summer programs, or setting up special arrangements for team teaching, flexible scheduling, or programmed instruction. They are more

likely to prepare a program guide. Although they are active professionally outside their school and noticeably more active in professional negotiations, they are somewhat less involved in certain activities, including informing their departments about new developments in curriculum research and articulation, particularly with the lower grades.

With an even somewhat higher proportion of male department leaders than exists in the total survey population, the group averages five years of experience as department head. Almost half have been in that position four years or less. These department heads are more likely to have taken a graduate course within the past three years but somewhat less likely to have had professional preparation for the leadership position. They are somewhat less frequently members of the several professional organizations of English teachers. Fewer of this group report system requirements for their position beyond requirements for teaching. Although fewer respondents lack a job description, more have expressed the need for its better definition. Although only five respondents have contracts for longer than the school year, most others report the necessity of some summer work. They are more likely to be paid an additional stipend, most frequently under $1000, than a salary based on a ratio. For 1974-1975, they report a median salary of $15,300, with fewer in this group indicating a permanent appointment. The majority are formally evaluated only as teachers.

Among the types of support listed in the questionnaire, indications are that the head of a smaller department is somewhat less likely than the average department head to receive a budget for at least some conference fees, tuition for professional improvement, and effective leadership or support from high school administration, school committee, and parents and community. Full cooperation of English teachers is, however, even more strongly reported. Such a department head has even less chance of professional clerical assistance, a private office or telephone, or ready access to modern office equipment. Over half report receiving no hours of assistance. It is not surprising, therefore, that the heads of small departments report spending considerable time on day-to-day routines, planning meetings, and preparing reports, and less time on supervision and curriculum than the general population of the survey.

In assessing their department in relation to the Eighteen Recommendations of the Conference of Secondary School English Department Chairmen, they express less satisfactory implementation of the recommendations for selection and assignment of teachers, inservice development, student teacher internships, clearly defined supervisory and evaluative responsibilities, time to inform the public, compensation for curriculum development, provision of an English center and room libraries, and the establishment of the Right-to-Read policy. Although they have more teaching responsibilities, they do not express any greater concern than does the general survey population about the non-implementation of the recommendation for released time for department business. They seem to view themselves more as teachers than as administrators, and the specifications of their jobs concur with this self-assessment.

Compared to the total population of the survey, smaller departments are reported with less frequency in local academic high schools and more frequently in regional academic and vocational high schools. While there are fewer small departments proportionately in Greater Boston and the Northeast regions of the state, there are more in the Southeast and Greater Worcester areas. In summary, these department heads report a similar wide range of managerial functions but less varied activity in teacher selection, supervision, curriculum, and professional leadership. An "optimism index" was assigned, admittedly subjective, to those who returned their answers to the open-ended questions. The computer analysis indicated a generally less optimistic reading for heads of smaller departments.

B. Head of a Medium-Sized Department

The seventy-eight heads of medium-sized departments, who supervise from eleven to twenty-five full-time teachers, present, as might be expected, a profile similar in most areas to that of the total respondent population but with some variance. The median of the high school population for this group is 1300, but the schools range in size from under one thousand to over two thousand five hundred. If the high school is large, the department head is likely to supervise only that one sizable school. Others in this group supervise a number of smaller schools. The average department in this group has thirteen tenured and three or four non-tenured teachers. Perhaps, because the department head in this group often supervises only one good-sized

high school, there is somewhat more involvement in teacher and pupil scheduling, locating potential teachers, supervising student and substitute teachers, engaging outside specialists, arranging summer programs, developing a resource center and an Advanced Placement program, district planning, and articulation with the lower grades. Such a department head is less likely to prepare a program guide, engage in professional negotiations, or assume a leadership position in a professional organization.

The average department head in this group is about three years older than the average respondent to the survey and has one or two years' more experience in the leadership role. The job description is somewhat more likely either to be non-existent, lacking in clear definition, or constructed without department head input. The median salary reported for 1974-1975 is $17,000, and the majority consider that their appointment involves tenure rights.

These department heads have a slightly better chance to receive tuition for professional improvement, the support of high school administration and of parents and community, and the cooperation of English teachers. Although full-time professional clerical assistance is very rare, they are somewhat more likely to have part-time assistance, an office, and access to modern office equipment. Less than a third, though, have a telephone.

Their assessment of the implementation of the Eighteen Recommendations of CSSEDC generally follows the pattern of the total population. Items which noticeably need strengthening are the recommendations for a steering committee in larger departments of fifteen or more teachers, inservice development, time to inform the public, clerical assistance, and the provision of room libraries.

As in the total survey, one-fourth of these department heads are located in Greater Boston. Compared to the total survey population, there is an even greater representation of medium-sized departments in the Northeast sector, and a lesser portion in the Southeast region.

C. Head of a Large Department

The twenty-three heads of large departments responding to the survey supervise from twenty-six to over sixty full-time teachers and have responsibilities, in a ratio of

2:1, beyond the high school grades. The average high school supervised by them has about two thousand one hundred students. While about half of these department leaders are called department heads or chairpersons, the other half have the title of coordinator, director, or other designation such as program director or assistant principal. About one-third work with other supervisory personnel for the department of English. Along with their full-time teachers, over half of these respondents report some part-time teachers, usually one to five. In their departments are, on the average, nine untenured teachers, requiring usually more supervision. Over one-fifth have an aide. On the average, they are responsible for the English program in three schools.

While the average department head in this group teaches one class, 34% have no regular teaching responsibilities, and none has more than two classes. They are not assigned study hall or homeroom duties; three report other duties such as corridor or lunchroom patrol. Among the managerial activities, they are more likely than the average department head to balance classes and teaching loads, prepare requests for federal and other grants, develop coordination with other departments, and be engaged in problem-solving. In each of the teacher selection activities, these department heads are more involved. There is more frequent participation in most of the supervisory activities, particularly working with student teachers, developing inservice programs, teaching demonstration classes, helping teachers to individualize instruction, supervising grading standards, and developing testing procedures for the department. All are involved in the teacher evaluation process, mostly in cooperation with the principal. In almost all of the curriculum responsibilities, these department heads are more frequently engaged, notably in developing research procedures for the evaluation of curriculum, engaging community participation in curriculum decision-making, obtaining outside specialists, developing summer programs, setting up a professional library, developing a departmental philosophy, establishing a resource center, organizing an open file and a program guide, and developing Advanced Placement, humanities, and team-teaching programs. In the area of professional leadership, the heads of large departments report greater participation in school committee meetings, district planning, informing their departments about research and innovation, evaluation teams, professional leadership positions, public relations, articula-

tion, especially with lower grades, and attendance at and participation in conferences. They are less frequently involved in professional negotiations.

Although more in this group omitted the age question, those who responded also average in the early forties. In contrast to the general population of respondents, over half of these department heads are women. Though the group averages six to seven years as department head, more than one in five are in the first or second year of departmental leadership. The median respondent holds a master's degree with thirty or more hours beyond or a CAGS. There are 17.4% with doctorates. For their position, a master's degree is more likely to be a requirement. This group has a slightly better chance of having had professional preparation for this position. In each of the four English teaching organizations listed in the questionnaire, membership is more frequent.

More department heads in this group consider that their job description is satisfactorily defined, and they have a slightly better chance of having had input into it. Only one respondent lacked a job description. While the majority have the same official school year as teachers, although in actuality longer, 13% are on an eleven-month year. This group is about evenly divided between those receiving an extra stipend and those on an administrative ratio. While just over one-fifth in this group did not indicate their salary, the median for those reporting it for 1974-1975 is $19,000. A percentage of 39.1 indicate that their position is non-permanent or non-tenured. More than half of these department heads were appointed from within the department, a slightly higher proportion than generally. While the principal is still very often the evaluator of the work of the department head, often the superintendent, assistant superintendent, or supervisor is involved in the process. About 30% of the respondents are either not evaluated for the position or are mainly self-evaluated.

The head of a large department has a better chance to receive time to fulfill extramural professional obligations, reimbursement for conference fees, and a budget for at least some conference expenses. The department heads are somewhat more positive about receiving the support of the high school and central administrations, school committee, and parents and community. Perhaps, because of the

large schools involved, they are less sanguine about working in a healthy school environment with good teacher morale and receiving the full cooperation of English teachers.

Over one-fourth have full-time professional clerical assistance, and another one-fourth receive part-time assistance of this type. Over one-fifth have a full-time or part-time paid teacher aide or paraprofessional, and one-fifth report that a teacher is assigned to assist one or more periods regularly. With over 80% reporting affirmatively, these department heads are much more likely to have a private office and telephone and ready access to modern office equipment. With more hours of assistance available to them, they also report more time given to supervision and curriculum. With more likelihood of clerical assistance, they give less time to preparing reports and more time than the average head of department does to travel, teacher selection, and professional leadership. Yet, with 13% reporting no paid or unpaid assistance for these larger departments, it is not surprising that they spend more time on day-to-day and other managerial activities and more time on the overall job.

Although the heads of large departments report greater implementation of the Eighteen Recommendations of CSSEDC, they do report in significant number certain recommendations not being in effect at all: steering committee, 38.4%, time to inform the public, 21.7%; compensation available for curriculum development, 39.1%; clerical assistance, 65.2%; room libraries, 34.8%; Right-to-Read policy, 30.4%. They are less concerned about the recommendation for released time, as their situations are apparently more in line with the CSSEDC recommendation.

A greater proportion, 95.7%, of these respondents head departments in local academic high schools, with the remainder assigned to a regional academic high school. All of these department heads are located in the Eastern part of the state: 60.9% in the Greater Boston area; 13% in the Northeast region; and 26.1% in the Southeast region. Their jobs are strongly managerial with more extensive participation in each of the other supervisory and administrative roles. With their receiving more support and assistance, it is not surprising that, compared to the general population, a higher proportion in this group are optimistic in their outlook, less inclined to see their position as static or weakened, and more likely to describe it as growing stronger.

IV

REGIONAL VARIANCES

Heads of English departments in Massachusetts secondary schools share many responsibilities, concerns, and problems. Certain regional features appear to some degree significant and are summarized below.

A. Greater Boston

Forty-two of the respondents who head their high school English department come from the Greater Boston area on the Regional Map of the Massachusetts Department of Education. With larger high schools prevailing in this region, there is also a somewhat higher proportion of directors, K-12 assignments, and leadership roles shared with other supervisory personnel. The average department in this group has nineteen full-time English teachers plus some part-time personnel; more non-tenured teachers but fewer aides are found in these departments. Seventy percent of these department heads have no more than two classes to teach; rarely is a study hall or homeroom assigned to them. The types of managerial activity fluctuate in frequency: compared to the total survey data, there is less involvement in budget preparation, funding proposals, field trips, and videotaping, but there is more in teacher scheduling, balancing class size and teaching load, and problem-solving. Along with other slight variations occurring in teacher selection, supervision, and curriculum, these department heads are more likely to teach demonstration classes, encourage individualization, and develop Advanced Placement, humanities, and related arts programs. Among leadership activities, the group is less likely to participate in school committee meetings and professional negotiations but more likely to teach college methods classes and participate in professional conferences.

In this group, the members of which are slightly older and more experienced as teachers and department heads, the majority are men, although not as preponderantly so as throughout the state. Although fewer have taken a graduate course within the previous three years, more report some preparation as department head, particularly in the form of inservice work. There is somewhat greater satisfaction with

their job descriptions. The median salary for 1974-1975 was $19,700. Two-thirds of this group consider that their appointment includes tenure rights. Support and assistance factors are rated somewhat higher than by the general population, as is the implementation of the Eighteen Recommendations of the CSSEDC. This group of department heads seems to be more optimistic about their positions. With fewer respondents describing their job as growing stronger or weaker, there is a greater tendency among them to see the role as fairly stable.

B. Northeast Region

Of the thirty-three respondents from the Northeast sector, almost half, a higher proportion than generally, have responsibilities beyond their high school, which averages a pupil population of one thousand six hundred. Most function in one or two schools, but along with a higher number of K-12 assignments, a few have responsibilities in a large number of schools. The average teaching assignment is 2.5 classes. Along with slight fluctuations in managerial activity, this group reports greater participation in the teacher selection process, supervision, and curriculum work. Professional leadership activity is also higher than state-wide, although attendance at and participation in professional conferences is somewhat lower. With no variance in mean age, over three-fourths of this group are male. The department heads have a slightly better chance of having earned thirty hours beyond the master's degree, of being certified at the supervisory level, of having had some type of professional preparation for the chair role, of being a member of the English professional organizations, and of having an official year one or two weeks beyond the school year. Three times as many of them receive a stipend as are on a ratio-based salary. The median salary for 1974 to 1975 is reported as $17,000.

The group reports less official recognition for professional leadership activity, which is probably related to the lower participation in professional conferences. The group does acknowledge, however, more frequent reception of support factors and clerical assistance, at least to a limited degree; these assists may encourage them to emphasize the supervisory, curricular, and leadership components of their position. Among the CSSEDC Recommendations, greater need is indicated for the provision of a steering committee in large departments, of time to inform

the public about the English program, and of compensation for curriculum development. This group seems more optimistic overall and more likely to see a strengthening in their position.

C. Southeast Region

Thirty-eight respondents from the Southeast area are divided almost evenly between those heading smaller departments and those with medium-sized departments but also include three heads of large departments. The average high school has a population of about nine hundred pupils. The job profile in this area shows a high involvement in managerial tasks. The department heads are less likely to work with other supervisory personnel and are more involved in the teacher selection process. These department heads are somewhat more likely to supervise student teachers and substitutes, develop inservice programs, review lesson plans and grading methods, and plan testing programs. Curricular work is similar to that of the general profile, although engagement in summer programs is greater. These department heads show more participation in school committee meetings but less in school planning and professional negotiations.

Just as their attendance at professional conferences is higher, so is their provision with a conference budget. With a median salary close to the state mean, they are more often than not established on a salary ratio and more likely than most to have a longer official school year. The granting of tuition for professional improvement and of official recognition for professional leadership appears more frequent. While the "optimism index" shows fewer extreme responses, there is a slightly greater tendency to consider their position as growing stronger.

D. Greater Worcester

The position of English department head in the Greater Worcester area, as revealed by the thirty respondents from this region, is similar in profile to that of the smaller departments; the area does, though, contain a few larger high schools of over 1500, but none was reported over 2500. Vocational schools are fewer proportionately. In the area are four of the five respondents from junior-senior high schools with grades 8-12. Perhaps because

40% of these department heads work with other supervisory personnel, they are somewhat less involved in teacher selection and supervision. Compared to the profile of the head of a small department, they are more involved in school planning, public relations, and articulation with the lower grades but less likely to be teaching college methods classes, articulating with higher education, or developing an internship program for student teachers.

Although they show an even greater degree of membership in professional English organizations, their attendance at and participation in professional conferences is somewhat less frequent. In looking for reasons for a less optimistic outlook, attention might be given to the fact that, compared even to the small department profile, these respondents more often lack a job description, receive a slightly lower salary, have less likelihood of clerical assistance, register a lower estimate of school environment and morale, and receive less support from high school administration and other school-related groups.

E. Greater Springfield

Of the thirteen respondents from the Greater Springfield area, 84.6% head the English department in the high school only, a school averaging about 1500 pupils. Over two-thirds of these department heads, twice as many as state-wide, work with other supervisory personnel. All have regular teaching responsibilities, the largest number having four classes. These department heads are somewhat more likely than the average respondent to have study hall, homeroom or similar duties. Perhaps, because of their heavy teaching responsibilities and their administrative role-sharing with other supervisors, they are less involved in a number of supervisory functions, in teacher evaluation, and in some of the curricular duties specified in the questionnaire. There is somewhat less involvement in professional leadership activities. The department heads in this group, who are about evenly divided between male and female, have a younger average age of thirty-six, yet already average five years in the position. Although a higher proportion have taken a graduate course within three years, an equally higher proportion have reported no professional preparation for the department head position, and, it is also noted, none receives tuition for professional improvement. Over half belong to the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English but with a lower percentage than the

general survey membership. They are more likely to be evaluated by the teacher-evaluation form and to be on contract for the regular school year, although half actually work longer. Perhaps a significant contributing factor in their lower mean salary of $13,500 for 1974-1975 is the lower average age of this group. They are more often appointed from within their department.

Support features of their positions are mixed: more of these department heads report provision of time to fulfill extramural professional obligations, healthy environment and teacher morale, and at least part-time clerical assistance; but fewer feel that they receive effective leadership or support from high school and central administrations, school committee, and parents and community. With more respondents from this group indicating moderate amounts of support and assistance, a slightly higher "optimism index" was registered. Also, their responses to the open-ended questions indicate that, proportionately, fewer in this group consider that their position is growing weaker, and a higher percentage view their position as becoming stronger.

F. Greater Pittsfield

Of the seven respondents from the Greater Pittsfield area, two are coordinators with 7-12 responsibilities, but all seven operate within one school. Most function in schools from 500 to 1499 population; one smaller school is also represented. Four of these respondents work with other supervisory personnel. They average nearly four teaching periods. Their role is strong in managerial nature but lighter than most in teacher selection, supervision, and curriculum responsibilities. A higher percentage, however, prepare a student guide, organize a compensatory program for slower students, and have had service on an evaluation team or in a leadership position. Five in this group are men. None has been appointed department head within the past four years, and none has obtained certification as a supervisor. With the exception of the National Council of Teachers of English, membership in the English teaching organizations is lower; no one reports membership in CSSEDC.

Fewer in this group indicate taking a graduate course within the previous three years or receiving professional preparation for the department head position. While most in this group have earned a master's degree and under-

taken further work, the majority indicate that no requirements exist for their position beyond those for a teaching assignment. All have a job description, which most of them consider adequate. Their average salary for 1974-1975 is reported as about $15,000. They respond more positively about having a professional library, an English center, and support from central administration and their school committee. Although a higher percentage of this relatively small group have a full-time aide, most of this group of department heads lack a private office, telephone, and clerical assistance. There was insufficient response to the open-ended questions by this small group from which to draw any attitudinal inferences.

V

RECOMMENDATIONS BY MCTE

As a result of the survey data and the responses to the open-ended questions, the Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English makes the following recommendations:

A. All Massachusetts English Department heads, secondary and central administrations, school committees, and state and local teacher organizations should become familiar with and follow the Eighteen Recommendations of the Conference of Secondary School English Department Chairmen of the National Council of Teachers of English.

These recommendations, issued in their present form in 1972 and included in Appendix B, would perhaps, as one respondent stated, "suffice if fully implemented." Such is not the case in Massachusetts according to the answers to this survey. Emphasis should be placed on the following CSSEDC Recommendations which are not being satisfactorily put into effect in most local systems: 2, 8, 10, 11, 14, and 18. Most of these require recognition of need and firm support by school and system administrators.

Some of these national recommendations are renewed below and given specific application to conditions within Massachusetts. Additional needed changes have become apparent as a result of our state survey and are addressed in other recommendations below.

B. Heads of English Departments should be given the time and support services, according to their department size and supervisory responsibilities, to allow them to fulfill well their manifold duties.

The greatest need of the greatest number of respondents to this survey is TIME: time to carry out fully the multiple responsibilities of their position, especially those which directly affect the quality of instruction within the department. Administrators should recognize that the expenditure of both moral support and support services to their department heads will be returned many times over in more effective departmental leadership.

C. The CSSEDC released time recommendation (#9) should be fully implemented, but directors of English or administrative personnel assigned similar responsibilities under a different title may not be required to teach regularly even one class if their supervisory range is extensive.

Department heads recognize the significant value of teaching at least one class. Flexibility should be considered, though, in applying this recommendation. In a year when it is anticipated that much additional time will be required of the department head to undertake a major innovation, set up a laboratory, prepare for a ten-year school evaluation, supervise a large number of new teachers, initiate PPBS or MBO, or the like, some temporary modification of the teaching assignment should be possible. The department head can keep in touch by alternate means.

It is noted that it may be advisable for a department head who directs a very large department to have no regular teaching responsibility or to limit teaching to demonstration lessons or to relatively short units, thereby freeing a teacher temporarily to work on a special project of value to the department or school.

The department head stipend should reflect the size of the department to the extent that the economy of the system allows. Responses to the Massachusetts questionnaire have revealed inequities in salary which should be corrected by the local systems.

D. Where multiple teaching assignments are necessary in a smaller school, the number of types of preparations should be minimized.

Many department heads readily reacquaint themselves with varying types of classes and levels and take on a class which does not fit the schedule, interests, or talents of others in the department. No matter how experienced or willing the department head is, however, it is important to cut down on the time necessary for the preparation of teaching strategies and materials by limiting the number of teaching preparations.

E. Department heads should be freed wherever possible from assignments to study halls, homerooms, corridor, basement, lunchroom, and similar duties.

Department heads are hired to supervise and lead their departments. Except in extreme cases of need, such an assignment is wasteful of time and, therefore, of money. By becoming "visible" to larger numbers of students through more frequent classroom visits and being more available for student counseling, the department head can be a valuable presence and stabilizing influence throughout the school. Duties unrelated to the supervisory/curricular nature of the position should be assigned to more appropriate personnel.

F. Paid clerical assistance should be provided, at least part-time, according to the size of the department, to type letters, orders, and reports; to take charge of the book inventory and distribution; and to perform other clerical tasks.

If the administration and community have expectations of a superior English program, then full-time clerical assistance is important. It is not realistic or fiscally sound, however, to expect that, regardless of size, all departments will be assigned full-time clerical help. A department head who has had no regular clerical assistance might best be served by an appropriate allotment of part-time personnel, at least until some experience has been gained in proper utilization of clerical services.

Where full-time help is not possible or appropriate, administrators and department heads should explore together a variety of potential solutions. To ignore the problem, as is too often the case, is financial folly: it is a waste of the tax dollar to spend administrative pay to have department heads carry out, with frustration, routine duties more efficiently performed by trained clerical personnel, and to waste department head time which is acutely needed for leadership of the department.

G. A work area for English faculty should be provided as well as a private office and a telephone extension for the department head; and necessary office equipment should be readily available.

It is fiscally wise also that a suitable work area be provided teachers to plan, prepare materials, correct papers, and confer with parents, pupils, and other faculty. For the department head, a private office is essential for

conferences with teachers and pupils. The relatively small cost of a telephone extension will soon pay for itself in saving time for the department head, who otherwise might have to return to the school office several times to effect a business call. Similarly, necessary office equipment available for department head use will save frustration, time, and, therefore, money.

H. The department head should be directly involved in the selection of the English faculty, the assignment of teachers, and the decision on retention and tenure.

The department head is responsible for the successful functioning of the department and is best aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the present faculty and any need to balance the experience, philosophy, and talents of the department. Its head is best able to assess during an interview an applicant's background and qualifications for an English position and to evaluate the classroom performance and effectiveness of English teachers already on the staff.

I. Where formal observations and evaluations by the department head are required, a reasonable number of visits and reports should be expected, and where the supervisory load is unusually heavy, additional supervisory positions should be established.

Most department heads recognize that their main concern should be the improvement of instruction, and supervisory functions such as these are generally necessary and expected. Frequently, however, supervisory opportunities are limited for the department head by a heavy teaching load or a teaching schedule conflicting with that of a teacher who has a problem with a particular class or a teacher who has a part-time teaching assignment in the department and may be located in another school in the system. The expectations of the system for formal evaluation of teachers by the department head must be reasonable in the light of teaching duties and support services.

If supervision is shared, it is essential that the question of responsibility and authority be clearly understood. It is also important that the forms used for teacher observation and evaluation be reviewed regularly and that the department head be among those who have input

into revision.

J. Department heads should be encouraged to join and participate actively in the English professional organizations in order to keep fully informed.

From their own growth experiences, administrators usually appreciate the value of stimulating professional exchange with peers and realize the danger of professional stagnation through isolation. Often a valuable idea can be gained in a brief, even casual dialogue with an English department head from another school. Professional conferences are the source of new ideas, possible solutions, and a sense of renewal.

K. Time, opportunity, and recognition for the undertaking of professional leadership within and outside the school and the system should be provided.

Not only does such involvement allow the department head to develop professionally and to receive recognition and personal satisfaction, but it also encourages stimulating departmental leadership, which is often contagious for other members of the department. The survey results have shown a relationship between the provision of time, opportunity, recognition, and financial support to its department heads and the degree of their professional participation.

L. Inservice courses in supervision, curriculum development, and administrative skills should be provided for department heads, or vouchers to area universities should be granted for such courses.

The survey results have indicated that too many department heads assume their leadership position without adequate training in these important aspects of their job and too often have to develop these competencies through trial-and-error. Colleges offer few courses related specifically to the role needs of department heads. Since the need for pre-service teacher training has decreased, Massachusetts colleges and universities should be encouraged to improve their offerings of on-campus and inservice courses for departmental leaders. College faculties and secondary leadership could both benefit.

N. A clearly defined, written job description for the English department head should be prepared with input from the department head and include any requirements for the job; the job description should be reviewed regularly; and no extension of duties should be made without study of the effect on the department head position and an appropriate salary adjustment.

Respondents to the survey indicated clearly their concern that all aspects of this recommendation be implemented.

N. A department head required to work beyond the regular school year should be paid proportionately.

Most respondents find it necessary to extend their school year even when their contract does not require it and their salary does not include compensation for this duty. Possibly no other segment of the school community is called upon so frequently to give time and energy without appropriate reimbursement. If these "vacation" services are necessary to the position, the job description and salary should be so defined.

O. The salary of the department head should reflect fully the size of the department and the supervisory range, the extent of the responsibilities and duties, professional preparation, and years of service in teaching and administration.

While these factors did contribute to the wide range of salary figures volunteered by most respondents to the survey, it was noted that, even where these factors and the economic background of the communities were similar, inequities in salary appeared and should be corrected.

P. If the department head is evaluated formally, the criteria, method, and report should be clearly defined and available to the department head.

Even if teaching is a major part of the position, the department head should also be evaluated by criteria appropriate to the leadership role and by a clearly defined process. Only by being able to discuss the report fully with the evaluator and having a copy for later reference can the department head use the process to improve

performance. It is hoped that the evaluation instrument will be regularly updated, that the department head will have input into its revision, and that an opportunity will be provided for the department head to set certain goals of his own for the evaluation period, during which these goals will be given important consideration in the final report.

Q. Department heads should be informed of the advisability of obtaining a supervisory certificate in Massachusetts.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts currently grants, in addition to a teaching certificate, a general supervisory certificate. Information and an application form can be obtained from: Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Education, Teacher Certification and Placement Bureau, 182 Tremont Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02111. At this time, a fee of $10.00 is charged for each certificate.

A supervisory certificate is issued by a number of states; a certificate solely for department heads is rare but being more widely discussed. A Massachusetts supervisory certificate is not usually necessary at this time locally but might be necessary for consideration for a position in another state. It might also add to one's professional credentials if applying for another position in this state.

R. The Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English itself should offer area workshops for department heads and/or arrange for an area university to provide professional courses appropriate to the administrative and supervisory duties of the department head.

The Council has already established a series of regional meetings and conferences and will continue to develop its workshop program for department heads. The Council should make the colleges aware of the needs of this segment of its membership and encourage them to develop appropriate courses and programs.

S. The Massachusetts Council of Teachers of English itself should establish a state affiliate, within the Council, of CSSEDC.

Membership in CSSEDC presents several opportunities. The National Council of Teachers of English presently offers a valuable pre-convention program for department heads. It sends its membership regular newsletters and is in the process of preparing a handbook for its members. CSSEDC can make available a regional workshop of several days' duration. An affiliate group within the state English council can bring to the department heads of Massachusetts information and resources from the national group and its other state affiliates.

APPENDIX A

SELECTED RESPONSE FREQUENCIES[1]

1. Specific Supervisory/Administrative Responsibilities

a. Managerial Activities	%SHS	%JHS
Planning and conducting department meetings.	97.0	100.0
Preparing or assisting in drawing up the itemized budget.	92.7	100.0
Assisting in the preparation of or arranging pupil schedules.	70.7	41.2
Assisting in the preparation of or arranging teacher schedules.	93.3	64.7
Balancing class size and teacher load.	79.3	52.9
Requisitioning and distributing supplies and equipment	84.1	88.2
Maintaining a department inventory	97.0	100.0
Selecting and ordering books and other instructional materials.	97.6	94.1
Preparing proposals for federal, state, and/or private funding.	53.0	41.2
Coordinating plans, programs, and policies with heads of other departments	77.4	76.5
General departmental clerical work	89.0	100.0
Problem-solving for pupils, teachers, and parents.	84.1	88.2
Coordination of field trips.	62.2	76.5
Arranging taping of 21" Classroom, etc..	19.5	23.5
Other.	7.3	17.6
b. Supervision of Instruction		
Conducting the orientation of new teachers	80.5	64.7
Supervising the orientation and program of student teachers.	78.7	82.4
Orienting and supervising substitute teachers	71.3	76.5
Developing or assisting staff in inservice training programs.	65.2	47.1

[1]All junior high school respondents answered these sections of the questionnaire. Two of the senior high school heads (1.2%) omitted this section.

	%SHS	%JHS
Teaching demonstration classes.	22.0	29.4
Assisting teachers in adjusting the educational program to individual pupil needs and objectives.	80.5	94.1
Assisting teachers in evaluating their goals, methods, materials	84.8	100.0
Reviewing teachers' lesson plans.	63.4	52.9
Assisting teachers in evaluating their methods of grading pupils	66.5	58.8
Planning and preparing testing programs for the department.	50.6	52.9
Using videotaped demonstration lessons, locally or commercially prepared.	14.0	11.8
Other	3.7	0.0

c. Curriculum Responsibilities

Planning or revising some phase of the curriculum.	97.6	94.1
Planning and implementing research procedures for evaluating the curriculum	60.4	35.3
Developing or seriously modifying an elective program	87.8	29.4
Involving community participation in curriculum decisions	21.3	17.6
Engaging outside specialists (poets, actors, etc.) for classroom or school programs. .	50.6	47.1
Developing summer programs for enrichment or make-up	29.3	29.4
Assisting department in formulating a policy for handling attempted censorship	35.4	23.5
Developing a professional library for the department.	64.0	64.7
Assisting department in writing or revising its philosophy or statement of goals and objectives.	80.5	82.4
Developing a resource center or English laboratory.	40.9	23.5
Maintaining an open file for departmental planning and teaching	48.8	64.7
Preparing a program guide for students and teachers.	64.0	29.4
Organizing AP program or other special program for gifted students	40.2	41.2
Organizing a remedial or compensatory program for slower students	67.7	47.1

	%SHS	%JHS
Developing a student program of independent study or extended research.	51.8	11.8
Helping develop a humanities or related arts program.	39.6	17.6
Setting up team teaching, flexible scheduling, or programmed instruction	45.1	52.9
Other	4.3	5.9

d. Professional Leadership (within the previous three years)

Participation in some school committee meetings.	65.2	41.2
Participation in school-wide planning . . .	66.5	52.9
Participation in district-wide planning . .	23.8	11.8
Informing your department regarding new developments in curriculum research and teaching innovations.	74.4	76.5
Participation in such community-based groups as library board, parent organizations, and literary clubs.	15.9	11.8
Supervision of English textbook adoption procedure.	76.2	64.7
Participation in professional negotiations.	27.4	35.3
Member of a team evaluating other schools or colleges	26.8	5.9
Leadership position in a professional organization.	25.6	11.8
Participation in special public relations programs.	19.5	11.8
Teaching college methods classes.	12.2	0.0
Articulation with teachers of lower grades.	59.8	47.1
Articulation with higher education.	26.8	35.3
Attendance at a state, regional, or national conference of an English professional organization.	73.8	64.7
Participation in a conference program of such an organization	27.4	11.8
Other	4.3	5.9

2. Support Factors

a. Types of Support

Provision of time to fulfill extramural professional obligations such as meetings and conferences.	62.8	35.3

	%SHS	%JHS
Reimbursement for conference fees	65.2	58.8
Budget for (at least some) conference expenses	56.1	35.3
Tuition for your professional improvement	22.0	23.5
Official recognition for professional leadership beyond your assigned duties	16.5	5.9
Attractive, well-equipped English classrooms	48.8	47.1
Provision of a professional library for your department	36.6	23.5
Provision of a well-equipped English center or laboratory	22.0	17.6
Healthy school environment with good teacher morale	57.3	70.6
Effective leadership from high school administration	51.8	47.1
Effective leadership from system's central administration	30.5	29.4
Generally, full cooperation of English teachers	92.7	100.0
Wise, fair policy-making by school committee	29.3	17.6
Strong parental and community support	24.4	17.6
Other	3.7	5.9

b. Types of Administrative Assistance

Full-time professional clerical assistance	7.9	0.0
Part-time professional clerical assistance	25.6	23.5
Full-time paid teacher aide or paraprofessional	7.9	0.0
Part-time paid teacher aide or paraprofessional	8.5	5.9
Paid student clerical assistance	5.5	0.0
Unpaid student clerical assistance	18.9	0.0
Volunteer lay assistance	6.7	5.9
Teacher(s) assigned to assist one or more periods regularly	4.9	0.0
Private office	50.6	29.4
Private telephone	31.1	23.5
Ready accessibility of modern office equipment	49.4	35.3
Other	6.1	5.9

APPENDIX B

DEGREES OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CSSEDC'S EIGHTEEN RECOMMENDATIONS

Below are listed the responses to the survey question which sought information about the degree of implementation of the Eighteen CSSEDC Recommendations.

Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of implementation for each recommendation according to the following scale:

Fully implemented 1
Partially implemented 2
Slightly implemented. 3
Not in effect 4
Not applicable. 5

The results are reported below in percentages for both senior and junior high schools and may be read as follows: 1. 44.5/11.7 = the particular recommendation was "fully implemented 1. by 44.5% of the responding high schools and by 11.7% of the responding junior high schools."

I. "Each English department must develop a written philosophy for the teaching of English in its school. This philosophy should reflect the uniqueness of the English discipline and the diversity of students, teachers, and other members of the community."

1. 44.5/11.7 2. 34.8/47.0 3. 11.0/23.5
4. 6.7/ 5.8 5. 0/0 No Response(NR)=3.0/11.7

II. "In large departments (fifteen or more teachers), representatives should be appointed for the year to serve with the chairman as a steering committee concerned with curricular matters, book titles, and materials; and such teachers should be given common preparation periods and released time for meeting."

1. 4.9/0 2. 7.9/11.7 3. 11.6/0
4. 31.1/17.6 5. 38.4/58.8 NR 4.3/11.7

III. "Department chairmen should serve as catalysts in developing student-centered curriculums that recognize the broad range of student needs."

1. 29.9/29.4	2. 42.1/23.5	3. 17.1/23.5
4. 4.9/11.7	5. 1.8/0	NR 4.3/11.7

IV. "The department chairman must have the primary responsibility for selecting and employing English teachers and assigning the teachers within their areas of competence."

1. 36.0/17.6	2. 29.3/41.1	3. 17.1/17.6
4. 11.0/11.7	5. 3.0/0	NR 3.7/11.7

V. "The chairman should ascertain the department's needs for inservice courses, conferences (including articulation), institutes, and workshops; advise and counsel personnel within the department; and consult with college and district authorities toward providing pertinent offerings."

1. 20.7/11.7	2. 29.9/11.7	3. 24.4/23.5
4. 19.5/23.5	5. 1.8/17.6	NR 3.7/11.7

VI. "The chairman should have clearly defined responsibilities for the supervision and evaluation of personnel and the administration of the department."

1. 47.6/29.4	2. 28.7/47.0	3. 12.8/11.7
4. 5.5/0	5. 2.4/0	NR 3.0/11.7

VII. "The chairman should direct the continued evaluation of student performance in all aspects of the English curriculum."

1. 28.0/17.6	2. 36.0/41.1	3. 22.0/11.7
4. 9.1/17.6	5. 1.2/0	NR 3.0/11.7

VIII. "The English department chairman should have adequate time to inform the public concerning the teaching of English in his community."

1. 9.8/ 5.8	2. 14.6/17.6	3. 28.0/29.4
4. 37.2/23.5	5. 6.1/11.7	NR 3.7/11.7

IX. "The English chairman should be released one period for each five teachers (or major fraction thereof) in the department to perform the duties of the English chairman. Each chairman should teach at least one class and the released time should be in addition to his regular preparation period. Further, he should receive a stipend that reflects the number of teachers and class sections in the department."

1.	26.2/41.1	2.	26.8/23.5	3.	14.6/ 5.8
4.	21.3/11.7	5.	4.9/ 5.8	NR	4.9/11.7

X. "Released time or compensatory pay should be given to teachers who are involved in curriculum development."

1.	19.5/17.6	2.	17.1/23.5	3.	14.0/ 5.8
4.	43.3/41.1	5.	1.8/0	NR	4.3/11.7

XI. "Every English department should have clerical help in relation to the number of teachers in the department: one full-time clerk for each fifteen teachers."

1.	7.9/ 5.8	2.	9.1/11.7	3.	12.8/11.7
4.	60.4/41.1	5.	6.7/17.6	NR	3.0/11.7

XII. "Teachers must accept responsibility for acquiring competence in the major areas of the discipline."

1.	48.2/29.4	2.	38.4/35.2	3.	6.1/17.6
4.	3.0/0	5.	1.2/ 5.8	NR	3.0/11.7

XIII. "Every department should have an English center to house its professional library and teaching materials collection, its file of teacher-prepared materials that have been found effective, its audio-visual equipment, and its work space for teachers."

1.	20.7/ 5.8	2.	24.4/35.2	3.	20.7/23.5
4.	29.9/23.5	5.	0.6/0	NR	3.7/11.7

XIV. "Room libraries of approximately 500 selected titles should be provided for every English classroom, and a resource center should be provided that includes periodicals, microfilm readers, typewriters, class sets of books, and materials for student use."

1. 4.3/ 5.8	2. 14.0/ 5.8	3. 19.5/17.6
4. 53.7/52.9	5. 3.7/ 5.8	NR 4.3/11.7

XV. "The English faculty of each school should select its own books and develop its own materials."

1. 77.4/41.1	2. 14.0/29.4	3. 4.3/17.6
4. 1.2/0	5. 0/0	NR 3.0/11.7

XVI. "In cooperation with teacher-education institutions, the chairman and members of the department should provide constructive internships for student teachers."

1. 47.0/47.0	2. 26.2/23.5	3. 12.2/ 5.8
4. 7.9/11.7	5. 3.0/0	NR 3.7/11.7

XVII. "English teachers should be encouraged to visit English classes in their own and other schools, and at other levels of instruction, with provision for payment of substitutes."

1. 23.8/17.6	2. 31.7/29.4	3. 23.2/35.2
4. 17.7/ 5.8	5. 0.6/0	NR 3.0/11.7

XVIII. "The chairman and members of the department should establish a policy, as suggested in The Students' Right to Read, *for handling community complaints about English curriculum."*

1. 21.3/11.7	2. 22.0/11.7	3. 12.2/17.6
4. 39.0/47.0	5. 1.8/0	NR 3.7/11.7

APPENDIX C

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR ENGLISH DEPARTMENT HEADS

Beck, William R., and Rosenberger, David S. "Chairman: Where Does He Fit In?" *Clearing House*, XLVI (September 1971), 48-51.

Berrier, G. Galin. "Department Chairman: What Does He Do?" *Clearing House*, XLVIII (March 1974), 432-36.

Bork, David. "DSC (Department Specialist Chairman): Leader for Quality Instruction." *Minnesota Journal of Education*, XLVII (March 1967), 19.

Brodbelt, S. "Impact of Educational Accounting Upon Teachers and Supervisors." *High School Journal*, LVI (November 1972), 55-66.

Buser, Robert L., and Humm, William L. "Department Head Revisited." *Journal of Secondary Education*, 45 (October 1970), 281-84.

————, and Manlove, Donald C. "Department Chairman: A Model Job Description." *Journal of Secondary Education*, XLV (January 1970), 9-12.

Callahan, Michael G. *The Effective School Department Head*. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.

Clement, Stanley L. "Choosing the Department Head." *NASSPB*, XLV (October 1961), 48-52.

Conference of Secondary School English Department Chairmen. "Eighteen Recommendations for Secondary English Departments." *CSSEDC Newsletter*, vol. 3, no. 2, May 1972, 1-2.

Crowder, Bruce H. "The Quabbin Story." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 1975.

Dicker, Saul S. "Department Head as Instructional Supervisor." *Catholic Educational Review*, 65 (December 1967), 590-97.

Easterday, Kenneth E. "Department Chairman: What Are His Duties and Qualifications?" *NASSPB*, XLIX (October 1965), 77-85.

Geils, Kenneth. "Chairman: A Wearer of Many Hats." *Clearing House*, XLVIII (December 1973), 248-52.

High, Paul B. "The Supervisory Role of the Department Head." *Clearing House*, XL (December 1965), 213-15.

Hipple, Theodore W. "Towards Improved English Department Meetings." *English Journal*, LVIII (March 1969), 440-42.

Hipps, G. Melvin. "Supervision: A Basic Responsibility of the Department Head." *Clearing House*, XXXIX (April 1965), 487-91.

Kidd, Jim L. "The Department Headship and the Supervisory Role." *NASSPB*, 49 (October 1965), 70-76.

Manlove, Donald C., and Buser, Robert L. "The Department Head: Myths and Reality." *NASSPB*, L (November 1966), 99-107.

Nelson, Paul S. "Orientation of New English Teachers: A Major Role for the Department Chairman." *English Journal*, LVII (March 1968), 409-15.

Pennsylvania CSSEDC. "A Recommended Basic Job Description for English Department Chairmen in Pennsylvania," 1974.

Ruggless, Charles B. "Nominal High School English Department Chairman." *English Journal*, LIV (May 1965), 375-78.

Ruth, Leo. "Developing Better English Departments: A Plan for Engaging Administrative Support." *English Journal*, LVI (November 1967), 1142-47.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. *Handbook for Effective Department Leadership*. New York: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1977.

Shea, George R., Jr. "Department Heads: Teachers or Administrators?" *The Massachusetts Teacher*, April 1976, 18-20.

Squire, James R., and Applebee, Roger K. *High School English Instruction Today*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

; Applebee, Roger K.; and Lacampagne, Robert J. *High School Departments of English: Their Organization, Administration, and Supervision*. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1965.

Stern, Malcolm Eugene. "The English Department Chairman: A Job Description." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1970.

Thomas, Donald. "Which Organization--Department or Division--for Your School?" *NASSPB*, XLIX (October 1965), 49-58.

Thorum, Reho F. "Department Head in the Large Senior High School." *Clearing House*, XLIII (January 1969), 264-66.

Veidemanis, Gladys. "Frankly Speaking: A Candid View of the Department Chairman's Role." *English Journal*, LVI (September 1967), 828-33.

Verchota, James W. "Department Chairman: Manager or Specialist." *High School Journal*, 55 (December 1971), 128-32.